entering a pre-game mode in which one or more pre-game information screens are displayed in sequential fashion to prompt entry of data defining parameters of an upcoming game, and in which a choice is provided among a plurality of game-interactive information screens for subsequently recording data during the upcoming game defined by the parameters entered in the pre-game mode, wherein the number of pre-game information screens displayed in sequential fashion in the pre-game mode is determined by which of the game-interactive information screens is chosen;

entering the game-interactive mode to display the chosen game-interactive information screen;

entering data in the chosen game-interactive information screen corresponding to the game as the game is played, and simultaneously recording entered data in the memory of the computer unit; and

providing post-game reports based on the data entered in the chosen game-interactive information screen.

LAW OFFICES YOUNG & BASILE, P.C., 2001 COMMONWEALTH BLVD., SUITE 301, ANN ARBOR, MI 48105-1562 (313) 662-0270

4/10 Cont.

## REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, favorable reconsideration of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3 and 6-40 as suggested by the Examiner to eliminate indefinite phrases, to provide proper antecedent basis for a number of terms, and to clarify the "phrase context" order noted by the Examiner with respect to the language in claim 10, (claim 10 has been rewritten as new claim 41). The amendments



71

are believed to satisfy the Examiner's objections, and therefore to traverse the rejection under § 112.

If the Examiner still deems that certain language is indefinite or lacks antecedent basis, he is invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney in order to discuss individual instances where correction is needed. Applicant can then file a supplemental response.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Barber. That rejection is respectfully traversed as follows.

With respect to claims 1, 15 and 19, the Examiner argues simply that general means for tabbing and scrolling "are so well known methods of display control and cursor control as defined in class 345, subclass 121+ that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine paging, tabbing and scrolling means with Barber's apparatus since such means are so well known for aiding display control and cursor movement control." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's argument regarding obviousness. The Examiner has been unable to cite any prior art which discloses applicant's claimed key entry means for a golf information recording and reporting device. It is not sufficient for the Examiner to replace the citation of prior art with his own opinion of obviousness.

Moreover, neither Barber nor the Examiner's opinion suggests the use of the claimed key entry means in conjunction with golf information screens which include screen-dependent data input fields. For example, Barber's golf recording apparatus



LAW OFFICES YOUNG & BASILE, P.C., 2001 COMMONWEALTH BLVD., SUITE 301, ANN ARBOR, MI 48105-1562 (313) 662-0270

provides a set of keys with fixed values (Figure 4) to fill in a number of non-screen dependent data input fields (Figures 6 and 7) which are exactly the same for every golf hole displayed; "changing" Barber's screens merely means displaying the layout of a different hole, while the data input fields remain exactly the same. Regarding claims 15 and 19, neither Barber nor the Examiner suggests different "entry key means" and "choice key means" for both sequential and non-sequential selection of information screens, nor selecting one of a plurality of game interactive information screens representing different levels of data-recording detail. Since Barber does not have different levels of data recording detail such as to applicant's three illustrated levels (Figure 2), Barber does not provide the appropriate key means for sequencing through them or non-sequentially selecting among several screens in a mode which has a high level of reporting detail and therefore a number of different option screens available.

Applicant has noted the Examiner's suggestions regarding inserting the word "only" in claims 1, 15 and 19, but at this time disagrees that it is necessary to so limit the claimed invention to distinguish over the prior art of record. The question, applicant submits, is not what ultimate scope applicant's claims might have, but whether the prior art cited by the Examiner discloses at least the minimum list of elements in the disputed claims. While applicant has amended claims 1, 15 and 19 to clarify the claimed key means, applicant notes that these claims are distinguishable on the basis of the keys' function in the context of the claimed environment (i.e., a golf information reporting apparatus). For example, as noted above, each of claims 1, 15 and 19 requires the key entry means to operate in complementary fashion with a number of golf information



LAW OFFICES YOUNG & BASILE, P.C., 2001 COMMONWEALTH BLVD., SUITE 301, ANN ARBOR, MI 48105-1562 (313) 662-0270

screens with screen/dependent data input fields; the Examiner has yet to find an example of a golf information recording apparatus with screen/dependent data input fields, which allows the use of the simplified key entry means in conjunction with multiple different information screens. The Examiner continues to rely primarily on Barber, which takes exactly the opposite approach: namely, providing a large number of value-specific keys with a single fixed data input field used for every hole on the course. Applicant accordingly submits that the rejection, which relies primarily on Barber, and secondarily on the Examiner's own opinion unsupported by art, is traversed.

With respect to the Examiner's comments in the office action regarding the use of a "kwerty" keyboard, applicant notes that a kwerty keyboard bears no relevance to applicant's golf information reporting invention, as it simply provides a large number of value-specific keys, and alone (or in combination with Barber) does not suggest the use of the non-value-specific minimal set of keys claimed by applicant in conjunction with a plurality of different golf information screens having screen-dependent data input fields.

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner appears to have misunderstood applicant's claimed term "screen-changing". Where the Examiner has interpreted "screen-changing" as changing some characteristic (e.g. "color") of a displayed screen, "screen-changing" as claimed by applicant, and as defined in the specification, refers to switching to a different screen. See, for example, specification page 6, lines 15-22. If the Examiner would prefer, applicant could replace "screen-changing" with "screen-switching", although "changing" is clearly defined in the specification.

With respect to claims 11-14, Barber again does not offer or suggest "screen-



LAW OFFICES YOUNG & BASILE, P.C., 2001 COMMONWEALTH BLVD., SUITE 301, ANN ARBOR, MI 48105-1562 (313) 662-0270

dependent data in put fields", but rather discloses fixed input fields which remain the same despite changes in the outlined golf hole.

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-26 and 28-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Barber in combination with Boman. The Examiner notes that Barber does not suggest taking into account any extrinsic factors, but argues that Boman discloses a system and method for recording and displaying golf data during game play which includes extrinsic factors. This interpretation of Boman is incorrect. The Boman disclosure is limited to a built-in weather sensor, in particular a "windage sensor" by which "the direction and velocity of the wind may be determined" (column 6, lines 11-12). This single factor is not correlated to the effect on a player's performance, nor does it correspond to the claimed step of entering extrinsic factor data in a pregame information screen as claimed by applicant; Boman's built-in wind sensor aids in calculating, during the game, "the apparent distance and proposed flight of the ball to the pin" on a shot-by-shot basis. See for example, Boman at column 6, lines 4-19. Accordingly, Boman's built-in wind sensor, used solely for adjusting the distance determination to the pin on a shot-by-shot basis, is not sufficient to suggest or make obvious applicant's claimed use of "extrinsic factors" in a method for recording and reporting golf information in a manner which correlates it to player performance and allows the player to learn from the recorded experience.

In other words, Boman does not record windage as an "extrinsic factor", but merely uses it for an on the spot distance calculation. So Boman does not suggest applicant's recording extrinsic factors (much less providing a choice for selecting which



LAW OFFICES YOUNG & BASILE, P.C., 2001 COMMONWEALTH BLVD., SUITE 301, ANN ARBOR, MI 48105-1562 (313) 662-0270

ones are recorded in a pre-game mode) and correlating those recorded factors to recorded player performance. Barber simply takes no notice of extrinsic factors. Since both of the prior art patents relied on for this rejection (Boman and Barber) fail to disclose or suggest the claimed recordal and correlation to player performance of extrinsic factors, the Examiner's rejection is therefore based solely on Examiner opinion. This is not a proper basis for a rejection under § 103.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1, 10 (now 41), 15, 16, 19, 20 and 27, provided that the foregoing amendments have sufficiently traversed the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason J. Young
Reg. No. 34,048

Dated: May 27, 1997

LAW OFFICES YOUNG & BASILE, P.C., 2001 COMMONWEALTH BLVD., SUITE 301, ANN ARBOR, MI 48105-1562 (313) 662-0270